

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17, 19, 20, and 22 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 19 are amended, Claims 18 and 21 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new Claim 22 is added by the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 8, 13, and 19 and new Claim 22 are supported by the original disclosure,<sup>1</sup> no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 19 was objected to; Claims 1-3, 5-17, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Mackintosh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,784, hereinafter “Mackintosh”) in view of Song et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030211843, hereinafter “Song”) and further in view of Singh et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030171977, hereinafter “Singh”); and Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Mackintosh in view of the Background Art. Claim 4 was indicated as including allowable subject matter.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that Claim 4 includes allowable subject matter.

With regard to the objection to Claim 19, Claim 19 is amended to correct the noted informality. Accordingly, the objection to Claim 19 is believed to be overcome.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Mackintosh in view of Song and further in view of Singh, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1 and 13 recite in part:

assigning a service session ID to the broadcast receiver  
***and a valid period for the service session ID***, said service  
session ID assigned at each acquisition request to identify a  
current communication connection;

---

<sup>1</sup>See, e.g., the specification at page 60, line 16 to page 62, line 17.

performing an authentication process on the acquisition request based on the session ID ***and the valid period, said authentication process failing when the valid period is expired.***

The outstanding Office Action conceded that Mackintosh and Song do not teach or suggest assigning a service session ID and cited Singh as describing this feature.<sup>2</sup> However, the outstanding Office Action did not cite any element of Singh as “a valid period.”<sup>3</sup> In fact, the cited portion of Singh, paragraphs 68-76, does not describe any valid time period for the session ID 1010 as defined in amended Claims 1 and 13. The timestamp 708 of Singh is a timestamp at which an activity occurred. If more than a given time has passed since the timestamp, a session is considered over. Thus, as the timestamp is assigned at the time of activity, the user is already logged on when it is assigned. Further, the timestamp is not used in any evaluation until long after the user has logged on. Accordingly, the timestamp cannot be used in any authentication process determining if the user is allowed to login, as this occurs *before* the user has logged on. Therefore, no authentication process fails when the timestamp of Singh is expired, and in fact the timestamp cannot be used in any authentication process, as it is not assigned until the user is already logged in. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Singh does not teach or suggest “performing an authentication process on the acquisition request based on the session ID ***and the valid period, said authentication process failing when the valid period is expired.***” as defined in amended Claims 1 and 13. Consequently, Claims 1 and 13 (and Claims 2-6 and 14-17 dependent therefrom) are patentable over Mackintosh in view of Song and further in view of Singh.

Amended Claim 8 recites in part “an authentication unit configured to performing an authentication process on the acquisition request based on the session ID ***and*** the valid period and provide an indication that the authentication process was successful or unsuccessful, ***said***

---

<sup>2</sup>See the outstanding Office Action at page 8, lines 9-17.

<sup>3</sup>It is assumed that timestamp 708 of Singh is being asserted by the outstanding Office Action as “a valid period.”

***authentication unit indicating that the authentication process was unsuccessful when the valid period is expired.”***

As noted above with respect to Claims 1 and 13, Singh only describes a timestamp 708 that is assigned at a time of user activity. Thus, this timestamp cannot be used in an authentication process, as the user is already logged on when the timestamp is assigned. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Singh does not teach or suggest “an authentication unit” as defined in amended Claim 8. Consequently, Claim 8 (and Claims 9-12 dependent therefrom) is also patentable over Mackintosh in view of Song and further in view of Singh.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 18, Claim 18 is canceled, making this rejection moot.


Finally, new Claim 22 is supported at least by the specification at page 60, line 16 to page 62, line 17. As new Claim 22 is dependent from Claim 1, Claim 22 is patentable for least the reasons described above with respect Claim 1. Further, new Claim 22 recites subject matter that further defines over Mackintosh in view of Song and further in view of Singh. For example, new Claim 22 recites that “the valid period is approximately 1 minute.” As Singh only describes a timestamp equal to a time at which a user action is taken, Singh does not teach or suggest a valid period of any duration, much less “approximately 1 minute.” Accordingly, new Claim 22 is believed to further patentably define over Mackintosh in view of Song and further in view of Singh.

Application No. 10/563,315  
Reply to Office Action of August 7, 2008

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bradley D. Lytle", is written over a horizontal line.

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.  
Registration No. 47,998